UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,982	06/21/2005	James T. Kadonaga	00015-023US1/SD2002-201-1	1391

26138 7590 11/16/2009

Joseph R. Baker, APC
Gavrilovich, Dodd & Lindsey LLP
4660 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 750
San Diego, CA 92122

EXAMINER	
STRZELECKA, TERESA E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1637	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,982	KADONAGA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	TERESA E. STRZELECKA	1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 February 2009 and 01 July 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 4-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *4,6,7,9,11-15,18,20 and 22-29* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,5,8,10,16,17,19,21 and 30-33* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to amendments filed February 27, 2009 and July 1, 2009. Claims 1 and 4-33 were previously pending, with claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 22-29 withdrawn from consideration. Applicants amended claims 1 and 30. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21 and 30-33 will be examined.

2. Applicants' amendments overcame all of the previously presented rejections. This office action contains new grounds for rejection necessitated by amendment.

Claim Interpretation

3. Applicants described the term "nucleosomal polynucleotide" on page 8, paragraph [0025], as follows:

"As used herein, a "nucleosomal polynucleotide" includes any nucleic acid associated with histone core proteins, or histone-like core proteins, forming a chromatin-like structure." Therefore, it is interpreted as any nucleic acid associated with histones or other proteins, as Applicants did not define the terms "histone-like core-proteins" or "chromatin-like structure".

4. Applicants defined the term "exogenous nucleosomal polynucleotide" on page 10, [0030], as follows:

"As used herein, an "exogenous nucleosomal polynucleotide" is a polynucleotide which is transferred into a target cell but which has not been replicated in that host cell;"

5. Applicants defined the term "target nucleic acid sequence" on page 10, [0032], as follows:

"As used herein, the term "target nucleic acid sequence" refers to polynucleotide sequences suitable for recombination with a nucleosomal polynucleotide." Therefore the term is interpreted as any nucleic acid sequence.

6. Applicants defined the term "recombinase" on page 11, [0033], as follows:

"As used herein, "recombinase" refers to polypeptides having essentially all or most of the same functions, particularly the recombinase can: (i) properly bind to and position a nucleosomal polynucleotide to a homologous target and (ii) facilitate homologous recombination."

7. Applicants did not define the term "isolated recombinase", therefore any recombinase that is not contained within live cells is considered to anticipate this term.

8. Applicants did not define the term "Rad51 activity", therefore it is interpreted as any recombinase activity.

9. Applicants did not define the term "plasmid", therefore it is interpreted as any nucleic acid vector or virus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21 and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramdas et al. (Mol. Gen. Genet., vol. 249, pp. 336-348, 1995) and Ito et al. (Genes to Cells, vol. 2, pp. 593-600, 1997).

A) Claims 1 and 30 will be considered together in claim 1, since the only difference between the two claims is the limitation "nucleosomal" preceding "polynucleotide" in line 10 of claim 1.

Regarding claims 1 and 30, Ramdas et al. teach a method for promoting homologous recombination, the method comprising:

generating an exogeneous nucleosomal polynucleotide in vitro comprising (Abstract):

contacting an isolated relaxed polynucleotide, the isolated polynucleotide comprising a desired sequence to be recombined with purified histones to generate a nucleosomal polynucleotide comprising histones (page 337, paragraphs 3-5);

contacting, under conditions that support homologous recombination, the exogenous polynucleotide with a target nucleic acid, wherein the target nucleic acid comprises a nucleotide sequence homologous to the nucleosomal polynucleotide (page 338, third paragraph); and

contacting the nucleosomal polynucleotide and target nucleic acid with a recombinase comprising Rad51 associated activity (page 338, third paragraph; the immediately preceding step and this step are performed simultaneously; recombinase with Rad51 activity is RecA, as evidenced by fourth paragraph on page 345).

Regarding claim 5, Ramdas et al. teach isolated RecA (page 338, third paragraph).

Regarding claim 8, Ramdas et al. teach contacting in vitro (page 338, third paragraph).

Regarding claim 10, Ramdas et al. teach exogenously provided nucleic acid (page 338, third paragraph).

Regarding claim 13, Ramdas et al. teach M13 plasmid, therefore they inherently teach coding sequences (page 337, fourth paragraph).

Regarding claim 16, Ramdas et al. teach core histones (page 337, fifth paragraph).

Regarding claim 17, Ramdas et al. teach a plasmid (page 337, fourth paragraph).

Regarding claims 19, 21 and 31, Ramdas et al. teach providing two different sequences, one of the M13 phage in the plasmid and the other of the ΦX174 plasmid (page 337, fourth paragraph; page 338, third paragraph; page 343, last paragraph; page 344, first paragraph; Fig. 9), therefore they inherently teach sequences which can introduce mutations into the M13 sequence.

B) Ramdas et al. do not teach using proteins that promote chromatin formation in the chromatin assembly reaction.

C) Regarding claims 1, 30, 32 and 33, Ito et al. teach several proteins the addition of which promotes chromatin assembly with proper spacing of nucleosomes in an ATP-dependent reaction, such as ACF and NAP1 (Table 1; page 596, second paragraph; page 597, paragraphs 3-7; page 598, paragraphs 1-3).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the proteins which promote chromatin assembly of Ito et al. in the method of investigation of homologous recombination of Ramdas et al. The motivation to do so is provided by Ito et al., who state that the chromatin assembled using ACF, for example, achieves periodically-spaced nucleosomes in reconstituted chromatin, in a fashion analogous to cell extracts (page 597, third and fourth paragraph). Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the additional proteins in order to achieve chromatin structure resembling in vivo structure, so that the studies of recombination would provide results meaningful to the mechanisms occurring in vivo.

13. No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TERESA E. STRZELECKA whose telephone number is (571)272-0789. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (571) 272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Teresa E Strzelecka
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1637

/Teresa E Strzelecka/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1637
November 3, 2009